

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stadler (US 5,236,548).

Claims 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stadler et al. in view of Inoue (US 6,769,948).

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, and 8 and added new claims 10-19 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are currently pending.

### **Priority Acknowledgement**

The Office Action acknowledges Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). However, the Office Action erroneously indicates that a certified copy of the priority document "has been filed in parent Application No. 61912/2002, filed on October 10, 2002." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that acknowledgement be made in the next Office Communication that the certified copy of the foreign priority document 61912/2002 has been received and filed in the instant application.

### **Drawing Objections**

The Drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Specifically, the drawings allegedly fail to show every feature recited by claims 7 and 8. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 7 and 8 to recite specific features explicitly shown in the drawings. Thus,

Applicant respectfully submits that the Drawings comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), and respectfully request that the objection to the Drawings be withdrawn.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that “[c]laim 4 provides for the use of first and second substrate, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass.” In addition, the Office Action alleges that “[a] claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.” Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Initially, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is neither directed towards a method nor a process. Specifically, claim 4 recites that the substrates “include a first substrate having a plurality of thin film transistor arrays and a second substrate having a plurality of color filters such that the first and second substrates are bonded together.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that no method or process steps are being recited by claim 4.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 4 further recites features of the substrates recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action’s contention that claim 4 “merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced” is inapposite to the features clearly recited by claim 4, as well as independent claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 4 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stadler et al. (US 5,236,548), and claims 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stadler et al. in view of Inoue (US 6,769,948). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a cassette device for accepting substrates including, in part, at least two supporting bars that “contact and support a first surface of the substrates along a first width direction of the substrates at opposing parallel regions of the first surface.” In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Stadler et al. discloses a circular magazine for holding disk-type semiconductor wafers.

In the Office Action, the spacing struts 8 and the semiconductor wafers 6 in FIGs. 1 and 2 of Stadler et al. are alleged to anticipate Applicant’s claimed “supporting bars” and “substrates,” respectively. However, in Stadler et al., the spacing struts 8 do not “contact and support a first surface of the substrates along a first width direction of the substrates at opposing parallel regions of the first surface,” as required by independent claim 1. In fact, since the semiconductor wafers 6 of Stadler et al. are circular, Applicant respectfully asserts that the spacing struts 8 of Stadler et al. do not contact and support the semiconductor wafers 6 “along a first width direction of the substrates at opposing parallel regions of the first surface,” as required by amended independent claim 1. Moreover, Applicant respectfully

asserts that none of the spacing struts 8 extend along a parallel direction in order to contact and support the semiconductor wafer 6 “at opposing parallel regions,” as required by amended independent claim 1.

Applicant further asserts that the Office Action does not rely on Inoue to remedy the deficiencies of Stadler et al. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that Inoue cannot remedy the deficiencies of Stadler et al. since Inoue is completely silent with regard to Applicant’s claimed “supporting bars” and “substrates.”

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because Stadler et al. and Inoue, whether taken singly or combined, neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-9.

#### **New Claims 10-19**

Applicant has added new claims 10-19 to further define the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 10-13 are allowable for at least their dependence upon independent claim 1, as well as the individual features each of new claims 10-13 recites. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 14-19 recite features that are neither taught nor suggested by the applied references.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: March 31, 2005

**Customer No.: 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001